1			
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
4	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) CR-18-00258-EJD		
6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) CR-18-00258-EJD) PLAINTIFF,)		
7) SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA VS.		
8) APRIL 15, 2020		
9	ELIZABETH A. HOLMES,) PAGES 1 - 34 DEFENDANT.)		
10			
11			
12	TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS		
13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDWARD J. DAVILA UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
14	APPEARANCES (TELEPHONICALLY):		
15	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE		
16	BY: JOHN C. BOSTIC JEFFREY B. SCHENK		
17	150 ALMADEN BOULEVARD, SUITE 900 SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95113		
18	BY: ROBERT S. LEACH		
19	VANESSA BAEHR-JONES		
20	1301 CLAY STREET, SUITE 340S OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612		
21	(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE.)		
22	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER:		
23	IRENE L. RODRIGUEZ, CSR, RMR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 8074		
24	PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY		
25	TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED WITH COMPUTER		

1	
2	APPEARANCES (TELEPHONICALLY): (CONT'D)
3	FOR DEFENDANT HOLMES: WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP BY: KEVIN M. DOWNEY
4	LANCE A. WADE 725 TWELFTH STREET, N.W.
5	WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
6	LAW OFFICE OF JOHN D. CLINE BY: JOHN D. CLINE
7	ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 500 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111
8	SAN FIVANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	1	SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA	APRIL 15, 2020
	2	PROCEEDING	S
10:17AM	3	(COURT CONVENED AT 10:17 A.M.)	
10:17AM	4	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK	YOU.
10:17AM	5	WELL, LET'S CALL THE CASE OF 18-258,	THIS IS UNITED STATES
10:17AM	6	OF AMERICA VERSUS ELIZABETH HOLMES. LET	ME STATE AT THE OUTSET
10:17AM	7	THAT WE ARE CONDUCTING THIS HEARING BY WA	AY OF TELEPHONIC
10:17AM	8	HEARING.	
10:17AM	9	THE COURT REFERS THE PARTIES TO GENE	ERAL ORDER 74 FROM OUR
10:18AM	10	CHIEF JUDGE PHYLLIS HAMILTON, AND WE RECO	OGNIZE BECAUSE OF THE
10:18AM	11	CURRENT COVID-19 CRISIS, HEARINGS CURRENT	TLY CANNOT BE CONDUCTED
10:18AM	12	IN PERSON WITHOUT SERIOUSLY JEOPARDIZING	PUBLIC HEALTH AND
10:18AM	13	SAFETY.	
10:18AM	14	THE SAN JOSE COURTHOUSE WHERE THIS C	CASE IS VENUED IS
10:18AM	15	CLOSED AND WILL BE CLOSED CURRENTLY TO MA	AY 1, AND THAT IS
10:18AM	16	SUBJECT TO REVIEW, OF COURSE. BUT THE CO	OURTHOUSE IS CURRENTLY
10:18AM	17	CLOSED, AND WE ARE CONDUCTING THIS HEARIN	NG OTHERWISE
10:18AM	18	TELEPHONICALLY.	
10:18AM	19	I'M GOING TO CALL FOR THE APPEARANCE	ES OF THE PARTIES IN
10:18AM	20	JUST A MOMENT. BUT LET ME ASK, WE ARE ON	N A TELEPHONIC HEARING.
10:18AM	21	I'M GOING TO ASK ALL PARTIES WHO ARE NOT	SPEAKING TO PLEASE
10:18AM	22	MUTE YOUR PHONES, PLEASE MUTE YOUR PHONES	S, AND YOU CAN UNMUTE
10:18AM	23	THEM, OF COURSE, WHEN YOU'RE CALLED UPON	TO SPEAK OR WHEN YOU
10:18AM	24	ARE SPEAKING, BUT I WOULD OTHERWISE APPRE	ECIATE THAT.
10:19AM	25	LET'S START THEN WITH THE GOVERNMENT	. IF I COULD CAPTURE

10:19AM	1	THE APPEARANCES FOR THE GOVERNMENT, PLEASE.
10:19AM	2	MR. LEACH: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.
10:19AM	3	THIS IS ROBERT LEACH ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES AND
10:19AM	4	ALSO ON THE LINE ARE MY COLLEAGUES JEFF SCHENK, JOHN BOSTIC,
10:19AM	5	AND VANESSA BAEHR-JONES.
10:19AM	6	THE COURT: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING.
10:19AM	7	LET ME TURN TO THE DEFENSE.
10:19AM	8	MR. WADE: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.
10:19AM	9	IT'S LANCE WADE ON BEHALF OF MS. HOLMES. WITH ME THIS
10:19AM	10	MORNING ARE KEVIN DOWNEY AND JOHN CLINE.
10:19AM	11	MS. HOLMES IS ALSO PRESENT ON THE LINE.
10:19AM	12	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MS. HOLMES, ARE YOU THERE?
10:19AM	13	THE DEFENDANT: YES. GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.
10:19AM	14	THE COURT: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING.
10:19AM	15	AND, MR. WADE, DO YOU RECOGNIZE THAT VOICE AS THAT OF YOUR
10:19AM	16	CLIENT?
10:19AM	17	MR. WADE: I DO, YOUR HONOR.
10:20AM	18	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
10:20AM	19	LET ME ALSO ADD A CAVEAT HERE, MR. WADE. I DON'T KNOW IF
10:20AM	20	YOU HAVE ENGAGED PROTOCOLS SUCH THAT DURING THIS PROCEEDING IF
10:20AM	21	YOUR CLIENT WISHES TO SPEAK WITH YOU PRIVATELY, SHE MAY DO
10:20AM	22	THAT. I NEGLECTED TO MENTION THAT AT OUR LAST HEARING, BUT I
10:20AM	23	WANT TO ENSURE THAT MS. HOLMES HAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK
10:20AM	24	WITH HER DEFENSE COUNSEL DURING THESE PROCEEDINGS.
10:20AM	25	MY SENSE IS THAT SHE IS NOT SITTING NEXT TO YOU OR DOESN'T

10:20AM	1	HAVE PROXIMITY NEXT TO YOU PHYSICALLY OR YOUR DEFENSE TEAM.
10:20AM	2	MR. WADE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THAT IS CORRECT.
10:20AM	3	WE ARE NOT NONE OF US ARE IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO ONE ANOTHER.
10:20AM	4	I APPRECIATE THE COMMENTS OF THE COURT.
10:20AM	5	AS THE COURT KNOWS, MS. HOLMES'S APPEARANCE WAS WAIVED IN
10:20AM	6	THE PRIOR HEARING SO I DON'T BELIVE THAT WAS AN ISSUE NECESSARY
10:20AM	7	TO ADDRESS THEN.
10:21AM	8	FOR PURPOSES OF THIS HEARING, IF WE FIND A TIME WHERE WE
10:21AM	9	BELIEVE WE NEED TO COMMUNICATE WITH HER SEPARATELY, WE'LL NOTE
10:21AM	10	THAT FOR THE COURT AND MAYBE SEEK THE COURT'S INDULGENCE
10:21AM	11	BRIEFLY SO WE CAN DO THAT VIA A SEPARATE LINE OF COMMUNICATION.
10:21AM	12	BUT MY HOPE IS THAT WON'T BE NECESSARY THIS MORNING.
10:21AM	13	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.
10:21AM	14	BUT I DO WANT YOU TO KNOW THAT I, OF COURSE, WILL AVAIL
10:21AM	15	MYSELF AND YOU OF THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH YOUR CLIENT.
10:21AM	16	WE'LL DO WHAT WE NEED TO DO TO ACCOMPLISH THAT. I KNOW YOU
10:21AM	17	HAVE OTHER COUNSEL THERE. PERHAPS I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY
10:21AM	18	PHONES MS. HOLMES HAS, BUT PERHAPS YOU CAN TEXT ONE ANOTHER OR
10:21AM	19	SOMETHING.
10:21AM	20	IF YOU NEED TO TAKE A BREAK, JUST LET ME KNOW, AND WE'LL
10:21AM	21	OF COURSE STOP THE PROCEEDINGS AND ALLOW YOU TO CONFER
10:21AM	22	PRIVATELY OFF THE RECORD WITH YOUR CLIENT.
10:21AM	23	MR. WADE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
10:21AM	24	THE COURT: YOU'RE WELCOME. ALL RIGHT.
10:21AM	25	LET ME ANYTHING FURTHER? ANYTHING ANYONE WISHES TO SAY

10:21AM	1	BEFORE WE PROCEED?
10:21AM	2	ANYTHING FROM THE GOVERNMENT?
10:21AM	3	ANYTHING FROM, MR. WADE, YOUR TEAM?
10:22AM	4	MR. LEACH: NO, YOUR HONOR. THIS IS ROBERT LEACH
10:22AM	5	FOR THE UNITED STATES. THANK YOU. NOTHING FOR THE GOVERNMENT.
10:22AM	6	MR. WADE: THIS IS LANCE WADE, YOUR HONOR. NOTHING
10:22AM	7	FROM US.
10:22AM	8	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.
10:22AM	9	LET ME THANK YOU FOR FILING DOCUMENT 372, WHICH IS YOUR
10:22AM	10	JOINT STATUS MEMORANDUM, AND I APPRECIATE YOUR DILIGENCE IN
10:22AM	11	WORKING TOGETHER AND GETTING THAT FILED IN THE SHORT NOTICE
10:22AM	12	THAT THE COURT GAVE YOU. IT'S VERY HELPFUL.
10:22AM	13	WE HAVE OF COURSE, WE'RE LOOKING FORWARD TO THE TRIAL
10:22AM	14	OF THIS MATTER, AND WE'RE DOING THIS UNDER THE UMBRELLA OF THE
10:22AM	15	CURRENT COVID PROCESS THAT CONTINUES TO POSSESS THE NATION, AND
10:22AM	16	WE'RE TRYING OUR BEST TO ACCOMMODATE ALL MATTERS IN OUR COURTS
10:22AM	17	WITH AN EYE TOWARD MAKING SURE THAT BOTH SIDES, EVERYONE HAS
10:22AM	18	FAIR ACCESS TO THE COURTS AND A FAIR HEARING IN THE COURTS.
10:22AM	19	I HAVE YOUR SCHEDULES HERE, AND I APPRECIATE OFFERING THE
10:22AM	20	SCHEDULES. I THINK WHAT REALLY WE NEED TO LOOK AT, AND I ENDED
10:23AM	21	OUR LAST CONVERSATION WITH THIS, WHAT IS THE REALISTIC SCHEDULE
10:23AM	22	FOR A TRIAL IN THIS MATTER?
10:23AM	23	I APPRECIATE BOTH SIDE'S EFFORTS TO AT LEAST PRESS FORWARD
10:23AM	24	TO SEE IF WE CAN HAVE THE CASE PRESENTED TO A JURY THIS YEAR.
10:23AM	25	AND AS I LOOK AT YOUR DOCUMENTS, YOU SUGGEST THAT BOTH SIDES

1 10:23AM 10:23AM 2 3 10:23AM 10:23AM 4 10:23AM 10:23AM 6 10:23AM 7 10:23AM 8 10:24AM 9 10:24AM 10 10:24AM 11 10:24AM 12 10:24AM 13 10:24AM 14 10:24AM 15 10:24AM 16 10:24AM 17 10:24AM 18 10:24AM 19 10:24AM 20 10:25AM 21 10:25AM 22 10:25AM 23 10:25AM 24

10:25AM 25

SUGGEST OCTOBER TRIAL DATES.

MS. HOLMES, THE DEFENSE SUGGESTS AN OCTOBER 26TH DATE.

THE GOVERNMENT DATE IS, PROPOSED DATE IS ABOUT 20 DAYS BEFORE

THAT, OCTOBER 6TH.

I ALSO APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT YOU RECOGNIZE THAT WE SHOULD HAVE AN INTERIM STATUS HEARING, WHICH I THINK IS WISE. YOU SUGGEST A DATE IN JULY FOR THAT. I THINK ALL OF THAT IS APPROPRIATE.

NOW, I DO NOTE IN THE DOCUMENT IT IS SUGGESTED THAT THE GOVERNMENT MAY SEEK, MAY SEEK A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT FROM THE GRAND JURY. AS NOTED, THE GRAND JURY IS IN SUSPENSION RIGHT NOW AND THEY'RE NOT ABLE TO PROCEED BECAUSE OF THE CLOSURE OF OUR COURTHOUSE UNTIL MAY 1ST. AND SO THAT REMAINS TO BE SEEN. THAT REMAINS TO BE SEEN WHETHER OR NOT A GRAND JURY WOULD INDEED ISSUE A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT. I THINK MR. WADE NOTES THAT IN HIS PLEADINGS AS WELL.

SO I WANTED TO ASK BOTH SIDES, PLEASE, TO COMMENT ON THE OCTOBER TRIAL DATE AS IT'S SET AND THE REALITIES OF THAT GIVEN THE FACT THAT THE GOVERNMENT MAY SUPERSEDE, AS WELL AS LOOKING FORWARD INTO 2021 FOR A TRIAL DATE IN EARLY 2021. I KNOW THE DEFENSE SUGGESTS THAT THAT IS A MORE REALISTIC DATE GIVEN NOT JUST THE COVID SITUATION BUT THE FACT THAT THERE MIGHT BE A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT FILED.

MR. LEACH, YOUR TEAM WAS VERY THOROUGH IN YOUR SIDE OF
THE -- YOUR PORTION OF DOCUMENT 372, THE JOINT MEMORANDA, BUT I

10:25AM	1	DID WANT TO GIVE YOU AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK FURTHER ON THAT.
10:25AM	2	SO WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS ON THIS?
10:25AM	3	MR. LEACH: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. I APPRECIATE
10:25AM	4	THAT. THIS IS ROBERT LEACH.
10:25AM	5	WE BELIEVE AN OCTOBER DATE IS REALISTIC REGARDLESS OF
10:25AM	6	WHETHER THE CURRENT CHARGING INSTRUMENT IS SUPERSEDED.
10:25AM	7	I WOULD NOTE THAT IT'S APRIL 15TH. WE ARE
10:25AM	8	THE COURT: YOU KNOW, LET'S MR. LEACH, WE'VE
10:26AM	9	PAUSED FOR A MOMENT BECAUSE THE AT&T LINE THAT WE HAVE,
10:26AM	10	REGRETTABLY, IT DOES INDICATE WHEN PEOPLE SIGN ON AND OFF, AND
10:26AM	11	WE'RE TREATED TO A LOVELY LULLABY OF BEATS.
10:26AM	12	WE'RE TRYING TO LOOK AT OTHER TECHNOLOGY THAT PERMITS US
10:26AM	13	TO ELIMINATE THAT, BUT REGRETTABLY, WE DON'T HAVE IT IN PLACE
10:26AM	14	FOR THIS HEARING. I APOLOGIZE FOR THAT.
10:26AM	15	MR. LEACH: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
10:26AM	16	I AM GOING TO CHOOSE TO HOPE THAT PEOPLE WERE JOINING THE
10:26AM	17	LINE RATHER THAN LEAVING THE LINE WHEN I WAS SPEAKING.
10:26AM	18	AS I WAS SAYING, IT'S APRIL 15TH TODAY. WE ARE SIX MONTHS
10:26AM	19	AWAY FROM OCTOBER. I DON'T THINK IT'S UNUSUAL FOR THE
10:26AM	20	GOVERNMENT TO SUPERSEDE A CHARGING INSTRUMENT, AND, OF COURSE,
10:26AM	21	THAT'S A DECISION THAT IS RESERVED FOR THE GOVERNMENT.
10:26AM	22	IN MOST CASES WHEN THE GOVERNMENT DOES THAT, THE FIRST
10:27AM	23	TIME THAT THE DEFENSE LEARNS ABOUT IT IS WHEN THE GRAND JURY
10:27AM	24	ELECTS TO RETURN THE INDICTMENT.
10:27AM	25	GIVEN THE COVID SITUATION, WE WANTED TO AVOID THAT, WHICH

10:27AM	1
10:27AM	2
10:27AM	3
10:27AM	4
10:27AM	5
10:27AM	6
10:27AM	7
10:27AM	8
10:27AM	9
10:27AM	10
10:27AM	11
10:27AM	12
10:28AM	13
10:28AM	14
10:28AM	15
10:28AM	16
10:28AM	17
10:28AM	18
10:28AM	19
10:28AM	20
10:28AM	21
10:28AM	22
10:28AM	23
10:28AM	24
10:28AM	25

IS WHY WE PROPOSED PROCEEDING BY SUPERSEDING INFORMATION AND PROVIDING THE DRAFT SUPERSEDING INFORMATION TO THE DEFENSE SO THE DEFENSE HAD AT LEAST THE GOVERNMENT'S PERSPECTIVE OF WHAT IT INTENDED TO DO.

I WOULD NOTE THAT THE DEFENDANTS MOVED TO DISMISS THE INDICTMENTS IN DECEMBER OF 2019. THEY COULD HAVE MOVED TO DO THAT EARLIER AND ELECTED NOT TO DO THAT.

THE COURT RULED ON THE MOTION TO DISMISS IN LATE FEBRUARY,

AND I DON'T THINK IT IS UNREASONABLE OR CAN COME AS A SURPRISE

TO ANYBODY THAT THE GOVERNMENT MIGHT REACT TO THE DISMISSAL OF

CERTAIN COUNTS.

SO I THINK THAT ADDRESSES A LITTLE BIT OF WHY I DON'T THINK ANY SUPERSEDING INSTRUMENT SHOULD COME AS A SURPRISE.

I ALSO THINK IT'S A BIT OF AN OVERSTATEMENT TO SAY THAT
THE PROPOSED CHANGES THE GOVERNMENT IS PURSUING REALLY CHANGE
THE TRIAL IN THIS CASE OR REALLY CHANGE THE PERSPECTIVE ON THE
CASE.

I DO NOT ANTICIPATE ANY NEW SUBSTANTIAL DISCOVERY. I
THINK WHATEVER DISCOVERY THE GOVERNMENT PRODUCED, I THINK WE
HAVE ALREADY PRODUCED THE VAST BULK OF IT AND THE REMAINDER
WOULD BE QUITE NEGLIGIBLE.

I KNOW IN THE STATUS CONFERENCE STATEMENT THE DEFENSE

MENTIONS WALGREENS. WALGREENS HAS BEEN IN THE INDICTMENT SINCE

DAY ONE. THEY MENTION SAFEWAY AND DOCUMENTS RELATING TO

SAFEWAY HAVE BEEN IN DISCOVERY SINCE THE GOVERNMENT'S INITIAL

1 10:28AM 10:29AM 2 3 10:29AM 10:29AM 4 10:29AM 10:29AM 10:29AM 8 10:29AM 10:29AM 9 10:29AM 10 10:29AM 11 10:29AM 12 10:29AM 13 10:29AM 14 10:30AM 15 10:30AM 16 10:30AM 17 10:30AM 18 10:30AM 19 10:30AM 20 10:30AM 21 10:30AM 22 10:30AM 23 10:30AM 24 10:30AM 25

PRODUCTION. THEY MENTIONED THE ADDITIONAL BOARD MEMBERS AS INVESTORS, AND THAT ALSO HAS BEEN IN DISCOVERY SINCE THE INITIAL PRODUCTION.

I WOULD NOTE THAT MANY OF THE MATTERS THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS PURSUING WAS IN OUR RULE 404(B) NOTICE, WHICH WE'VE BEEN PROVIDING SINCE THE OUTSET BUT SUMMARIZED ON MARCH 6TH, 2020.

SO WE WANT THE DEFENSE TO BE PREPARED. WE DON'T WANT THE DATE TO MOVE. I JUST DON'T THINK CHANGES IN THE CHARGING INSTRUMENT ARE ANY IMPEDIMENTS TO PROCEEDING IN OCTOBER.

AND I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO HIGHLIGHT THE CHANGES THAT
THE GOVERNMENT PROVIDED TO MS. HOLMES. I THINK IT'S LIMITED TO
EIGHT PARAGRAPHS OF THE INDICTMENT. WE ADD A SINGLE LINE IN
PARAGRAPH 3 THAT SAYS "THERANOS INVESTORS INCLUDED INDIVIDUALS,
ENTITIES, CERTAIN BUSINESS PARTNERS, MEMBERS OF ITS BOARD OF
DIRECTORS, AND INDIVIDUALS AND ENTITIES WHO INVESTED THROUGH
FIRMS FORMED FOR THE EXCLUSIVE PURPOSE OR PRIMARY PURPOSE OF
INVESTING IN THERANOS'S SECURITIES."

WE THINK THESE WERE INVESTORS WHO WERE ALREADY IN THE CASE

AND THAT THIS DOES NOT SUBSTANTIALLY CHANGE THE DYNAMIC OF A

TRIAL.

THE OTHER CHANGES ARE TO PARAGRAPHS 10, 11, AND 12, AND IT SIMPLY IS CHANGING A DATE FROM 2010 TO 2013.

WE AMEND PARAGRAPH 16 TO MAKE A FURTHER ALLEGATION AND TO IDENTIFY CERTAIN BLOOD TESTS THAT ARE SPELLED OUT IN THE BILL OF PARTICULARS.

AND WE CHANGE TWO WIRE FRAUD COUNTS IN PARAGRAPHS 18 AND 1 10:30AM 26 FROM PATIENTS 1 AND 2 TO BB AND ET. 2 10:30AM THAT'S THE EXTENT OF THE CHANGES THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS 3 10:30AM 10:30AM 4 PURSUING, AND WE DON'T THINK IT ALTERS THE LENGTH OF THE TRIAL OR REALLY CHANGES THE DYNAMIC THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT. 10:30AM WITH RESPECT TO COVID-19, YOUR HONOR, I DON'T HAVE SPECIAL 10:30AM 6 10:31AM 7 INSIGHT INTO WHAT THE WORLD IS GOING TO LOOK LIKE IN OCTOBER. WE HEARD THE COURT'S COMMENTS AT THE LAST CONFERENCE ABOUT THE 10:31AM 8 DIFFICULTY OF SERVING SUMMONS AND LARGE GATHERINGS. WE'RE 10:31AM 9 10:31AM 10 MINDFUL OF THAT. 10:31AM 11 WE THINK OCTOBER SEEMS FAR ENOUGH REMOVED FROM THAT AND 10:31AM 12 THAT THE BETTER COURSE IS TO PLAN FOR THAT AND CHECK IN IN JULY IF WE NEED TO, BUT PLANNING FOR 2021 JUST SEEMS LIKE WE'RE 10:31AM 13 PLANNING FOR FAILURE, AND I THINK THE BETTER COURSE IS TO SET 10:31AM 14 10:31AM 15 THE DATE, WORK TOWARDS THAT, AND IF AGAINST ALL OF OUR HOPES THE WORLD IS NOT IN A DIFFERENT SITUATION IN OCTOBER, WE CAN 10:31AM 16 10:31AM 17 REACT TO THAT. 10:31AM 18 BUT SETTING THE DATE OUT IN '21 JUST CREATES TOO MUCH 10:31AM 19 UNCERTAINTY AND IS REALLY PLANNING FOR FAILURE. 10:31AM 20 SO FOR THESE REASONS WE THINK OCTOBER IS REASONABLE, AND WE THINK THE COURT SHOULD ORDER THAT DATE. 10:32AM 21 10:32AM 22 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. 10:32AM 23 LET ME ASK IN REGARDS TO THE POTENTIAL SUPERSEDING 10:32AM 24 DOCUMENT, IF THE GRAND JURY DOES RETURN THE COUNTS AND THE 10:32AM 25 CHANGES THAT YOU'RE SEEKING, DO YOU HAVE A THOUGHT AS TO AN

INCREASE IN WITNESSES, PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS, ET CETERA, HOW 1 10:32AM 2 THAT MIGHT AFFECT THINGS? 10:32AM MR. LEACH: IT CERTAINLY DOES NOT CHANGE FROM THE 3 10:32AM 10:32AM 4 GOVERNMENT'S PERSPECTIVE WHO WE WERE INTENDING TO CALL IN THE 10:32AM 5 TRIAL. I THINK THE TRIAL STAYS THE SAME LENGTH. I THINK THERE ARE GOING TO BE WALGREENS, SAFEWAY AND BOARD 10:32AM 6 10:32AM 7 OF DIRECTORS WITNESSES IN THIS TRIAL REGARDLESS, SO I DON'T THINK IT CHANGED THE WITNESSES. 10:32AM 8 AND AS I ALLUDED TO EARLIER, YOUR HONOR, WITH THE 10:32AM 9 10:32AM 10 EXCEPTION OF POSSIBLY 302'S OR WITNESS STATEMENTS, I DO NOT 10:33AM 11 ANTICIPATE ANY SUBSTANTIAL DISCOVERY, CERTAINLY NOTHING 10:33AM 12 COMPARED TO THE 20 MILLION-PLUS DOCUMENTS THAT HAVE ALREADY BEEN PRODUCED IN THIS CASE. I THINK ANY REMAINING DISCOVERY 10:33AM 13 WOULD BE VERY, VERY NEGLIGIBLE. 10:33AM 14 10:33AM 15 THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ANYTHING 10:33AM 16 FURTHER THEN? MR. LEACH: NO, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU. 10:33AM 17 10:33AM 18 THE COURT: OKAY. MR. WADE. 10:33AM 19 MR. WADE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THIS IS 10:33AM 20 LANCE WADE ON BEHALF OF MS. HOLMES. I WILL START WHERE THE COURT HAS AND AS THE COURT DIRECTED 10:33AM 21 10:33AM 22 IN THE PRIOR HEARING WITH THE CURRENT HEALTH DIRECTIVES AND 10:33AM 23 SOME OF OUR THINKING ON THAT AS THE COURT MADE THAT INQUIRY. 10:33AM 24 AND WE, OF COURSE, THANK THE COURT FOR ITS CARE AND CONCERN 10:33AM 25 ABOUT THESE ISSUES AND OF COURSE ITS THE DESIRE TO KEEP ALL

10:33AM	1
10:33AM	2
10:34AM	3
10:34AM	4
10:34AM	5
10:34AM	6
10:34AM	7
10:34AM	8
10:34AM	9
10:34AM	10
10:34AM	11
10:34AM	12
10:34AM	13
10:34AM	14
10:34AM	15
10:34AM	16
10:35AM	17
10:35AM	18
10:35AM	19
10:35AM	20
10:35AM	21
10:35AM	22
10:35AM	23
10:35AM	24
10:35AM	25

TRIAL PARTICIPANTS SAFE THROUGH THIS ENTIRE PROCESS.

WE'RE OBVIOUSLY IN UNCHARTERED TERRITORY HERE, YOUR HONOR,
BOTH IN OUR DAILY LIVES AND IN OUR CURRENT OCCUPATIONS AND THIS
HEARING.

I THINK NONE OF US, INCLUDING SOME OF THE LEADING PUBLIC HEALTH EXPERTS, REALLY KNOW WITH ANY DEGREE OF CERTAINTY WHAT THE SECOND HALF OF THIS YEAR WILL LOOK LIKE FROM A HEALTH PERSPECTIVE.

NO ONE HAS A CLEAR IDEA OF WHAT CONDUCT WILL BE DEEMED SAFE DURING THAT TIME PERIOD OR WHAT PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL DISTANCING GUIDANCE MAY BE NEEDED.

BY EXTENSION, OF COURSE, IT MAKES IT VERY DIFFICULT FOR
US, AND I'M SURE FOR THE COURT, TO KNOW WHETHER THOSE
CONDITIONS WILL BE CONDUCIVE TO A LENGTHY JURY TRIAL SUCH AS
THE ONE CONTEMPLATED IN THIS MATTER.

WHILE THE PARTIES ARE, OF COURSE, YOU KNOW, IN COURT WITH GREAT FREQUENCY, THE COURT IS VASTLY MORE EXPERIENCED IN CONDUCTING ITS OWN PROCEDURES AND RECOGNIZES THE NUMBER OF CHANGES TO COURTROOM PROCEDURES AND PROTOCOLS THAT WILL BE NECESSARY TO TRY AND ADDRESS HEALTH RELATED ISSUES.

WE'RE CONFIDENT THAT THE COURT WILL DO THAT AND OF COURSE STAND PREPARED TO ASSIST THE COURT IN ANY WAY THAT WE CAN.

THERE'S NOTHING ABOUT THE PARTIES TO THIS CASE OR COUNSEL
IN THIS CASE WITH RESPECT TO THESE HEALTH ISSUES THAT MERITS
SPECIAL ATTENTION.

10:35AM	1
10:35AM	2
10:35AM	3
10:36AM	4
10:36AM	5
10:36AM	6
10:36AM	7
10:36AM	8
10:36AM	9
10:36AM	10
10:36AM	11
10:36AM	12
10:36AM	13
10:36AM	14
10:36AM	15
10:36AM	16
10:37AM	17
10:37AM	18
10:37AM	19
10:37AM	20
10:37AM	21
10:37AM	22
10:37AM	23
10:37AM	24
10:37AM	25

ALL FUTURE TRIAL PARTICIPANTS IN THIS COURT AND OTHER
COURTS ARE GOING TO HAVE TO WRESTLE WITH THIS NEW POST-PANDEMIC
WORLD IN HEARINGS AND JURY TRIALS WHEN OTHER COURT PROCEEDINGS
RESUME. AGAIN, WE KNOW THE COURT WILL CONTINUE TO WORK TO
PRIORITIZE THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF ALL OF US WHO APPEAR BEFORE
IT AS WE WORK TO ADAPT TO THAT NEW WORLD.

THERE ARE CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES RELATED TO THIS CASE, HOWEVER, THAT WE THINK HEIGHTEN THE HEALTH RISK.

AS THE COURT, AND THE GOVERNMENT UNDOUBTEDLY RECOGNIZED,
THERE'S A GREATER RISK OF TRIAL DISRUPTION FROM THE VIRUS IN A
TRIAL THAT OCCURS OVER THE COURSE OF 100 DAYS THAN A TRIAL THAT
OCCURS OVER THE COURSE OF 1 OR 2. THAT FLOWS FROM BASIC MATH
AND STATISTICAL PROBABILITY.

THE CROWDS THAT WILL LIKELY GATHER OUTSIDE OF THE

COURTHOUSE IN THIS CASE AND THEN FILL THE COURTROOM, AS THEY

HAVE IN NEARLY ALL PRIOR PROCEEDINGS, ADD TO THAT HEALTH RISK.

WHAT ALL PARTIES HERE IN THE COURT I AM SURE UNDOUBTEDLY WANT IS AS SAFE AND AS SMOOTH A TRIAL AS POSSIBLE, ONE FREE FROM DISRUPTION.

A MISTRIAL IS A REGRETTABLE EVENT IN ANY CIRCUMSTANCES,
AND IT'S OF COURSE A MASS OF CONCERN AND A BURDEN FOR ALL
INVOLVED WHEN THAT HAPPENS IN A LENGTHY TRIAL LIKE THIS.

WE CERTAINLY DON'T THINK IT'S PRUDENT TO START A TRIAL IF
THE PUBLIC HEALTH ENVIRONMENT SUGGESTS THAT THERE'S A
SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASED RISK OF A MISTRIAL.

10	:37AM	1
10	:37AM	2
10	:37AM	3
10	:38AM	4
10	:38AM	5
10	:38AM	6
10	:38AM	7
10	:38AM	8
10	:38AM	9
10	:38AM	10
10	:38AM	11
10	:38AM	12
10	:38AM	13
10	:38AM	14
10	:38AM	15
10	:38AM	16
10	:38AM	17
10	:39AM	18
10	:39AM	19
10	:39AM	20
10	:39AM	21
10	:39AM	22
10	:39AM	23
10	:39AM	24
10	:39AM	25

THIS IS WHY IN OUR DISCUSSIONS WITH THE GOVERNMENT AND IN THE PLEADING THAT WE SAID BEFORE THE COURT AT DOCKET 372, WE ARTICULATED OUR BELIEF EVEN BEFORE THE CONCEPT OF A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT WAS DISCUSSED THAT IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE TO DELAY THE TRIAL UNTIL EARLY NEXT YEAR.

GIVEN THAT THE GOVERNMENT WAS RELUCTANT TO DO THAT, WE OF COURSE HAVE TRIED TO FIND A WAY WHERE WE CAN MAKE AN ACCOMMODATION THAT WOULD ACCOUNT FOR SOME OF THE PARTICULAR LIMITATIONS AND TRIAL PREPARATION THAT RESULTED FROM THE CURRENT CIRCUMSTANCES.

AS THE COURT KNOWS, AND WE'VE DISCUSSED IN PRIOR CALLS,
THERE'S MUCH THAT WE CAN CONTINUE TO DO AND WE PLEDGE TO THE
COURT THAT WE ARE CONTINUING TO WORK DILIGENTLY WITH ALL TASKS
THAT WE CAN DO IN OUR CURRENT REMOTE WORKING ENVIRONMENT, BUT
OF COURSE THERE ARE MANY TASKS THAT WE CAN'T DO TO PREPARE FOR
TRIAL THAT REQUIRE ACTIVITIES THAT ARE ILL-ADVISED OR ILLEGAL
GIVEN THE CURRENT CIRCUMSTANCES AND PUBLIC HEALTH CONDITIONS.

OUR SUGGESTION INITIALLY FOR THE 90-DAY DELAY WAS DONE
WITH THE BELIEF -- TO LATE OCTOBER -- WAS DONE WITH THE BELIEF
THAT A DELAY OF THAT PERIOD WOULD HELP US ACCOUNT FOR SOME OF
THE LIMITATIONS THAT WE ARE UNDER IN THE REMOTE WORK AND
CURRENT HEALTH ENVIRONMENT. THAT'S WHY WE PROPOSED THAT
SCHEDULE.

WE RECOGNIZED WHEN WE PROPOSED THAT SCHEDULE, AND WE BELIEVE IT'S TRUE WITH ANY SCHEDULE THAT STARTS THAT LATE, THAT

1 10:39AM 2 10:39AM 3 10:39AM 10:39AM 4 10:40AM 10:40AM 10:40AM 7 10:40AM 8 10:40AM 9 10:40AM 10 10:40AM 11 10:40AM 12 10:40AM 13 10:40AM 14 10:40AM 15 10:41AM 16 10:41AM 17 10:41AM 18 10:41AM 19 10:41AM 20 10:41AM 21 10:41AM 22 10:41AM 23 10:41AM 24 10:41AM 25

THAT COULD PUSH US INTO A SITUATION WHERE WE'RE WORKING THROUGH THE HOLIDAYS.

WE, OF COURSE, IN NORMAL CIRCUMSTANCES WOULDN'T CONSIDER PROPOSING SOME STEPS, BUT WE RECOGNIZE THAT WE ARE IN EXTRAORDINARY TIMES, AND WE RECOGNIZE THAT IN TIMES SUCH AS THAT SACRIFICES ARE NEEDED. AND ENSURING THAT OUR CLIENT HAS AN APPROPRIATE DEFENSE, WE'RE PREPARED TO WORK THROUGH THE HOLIDAYS AS NEEDED IF THAT'S WHAT ENDS UP HAPPENING.

NOW, OF COURSE THAT, THAT PROPOSAL CHANGED WHEN THE GOVERNMENT INFORMED US AT THIS POINT THAT IT INTENDED TO SEEK A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT.

AND WHILE I APPRECIATE THAT COUNSEL FOR THE GOVERNMENT

DOESN'T BELIEVE IT WILL SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE THEIR TRIAL

PREPARATION TIME, I WILL MAKE CLEAR TO THE COURT THAT IF THE

GRAND JURY CHOOSES TO RETURN A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT ALONG THE

LINES MR. LEACH HAS DISCLOSED THAT HE INTENDS TO SEEK, WHILE

THE CHANGES IN LANGUAGE MAY BE LIMITED AND DESIGNED TO DO

MINIMAL VIOLENCE TO THE WORDS WITHIN THE INDICTMENT, THE

FUNDAMENTAL SCOPE OF THE INDICTMENT CHANGES SIGNIFICANTLY.

THE INDICTMENT, THE PROPOSED INDICTMENT, OR THE POTENTIAL SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT THAT MR. LEACH HAS STATED THAT THE GOVERNMENT INTENDS TO SEEK SIGNIFICANTLY EXPANDS THE TIME PERIOD THAT HAS BEEN THE FOCUS OF THE CASE. THE COMPANY DURING THE 2010 TO 2013 TIME PERIOD WAS IN A FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT STATE OF OPERATIONS THAN IT WAS DURING THE LATER TIME PERIOD

10:	41AM	1
10:	42AM	2
10:	42AM	3
10:	42AM	4
10:	42AM	5
10:	42AM	6
10:	42AM	7
10:	42AM	8
10:	42AM	9
10:	42AM	10
10:	42AM	11
10:	42AM	12
10:	42AM	13
10:	42AM	14
10:	43AM	15
10:	43AM	16
10:	43AM	17
10:	43AM	18
10:	43AM	19
10:	43AM	20
10:	43AM	21
10:	43AM	22
10:	43AM	23
10:	43AM	24
10:	43AM	25

THAT WAS IDENTIFIED IN THE PREVIOUS CONSPIRACY PERIOD. THE -ALTHOUGH THE GOVERNMENT HAS IN DRAFTING, IT APPEARS, INTENT ON
CHANGING THE DEFINITION OF INVESTORS AND THE SCOPE OF THE
INVESTOR RELATED CONSPIRACY TO INCLUDE OTHER PARTIES, IT DOES
NOT APPEAR TO US, BASED ON WHAT HAS BEEN REPRESENTED BY THE
GOVERNMENT, THAT THOSE ARE REALLY INVESTOR RELATIONSHIPS AT
ALL.

IN FACT, THOSE RELATIONSHIPS, RELATIONSHIPS LIKE THE
WALGREENS RELATIONSHIP, THE SAFEWAY RELATIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIPS
WITH BOARD OF DIRECTORS ARE FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT
RELATIONSHIPS THAN INVESTOR RELATIONSHIPS.

WALGREENS, SAFEWAY ARE CONTRACTUAL COUNTERPARTIES WITH THERANOS. THE COURSE OF DEALING BETWEEN THERANOS AND THOSE CONTRACTUAL COUNTERPARTIES IS FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT IN NATURE AND SCOPE FROM THE INVESTOR-RELATED RELATIONSHIPS THAT WERE OUTLINED IN THE PRIOR INDICTMENT.

THE INTERACTIONS WITH THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS ALSO
SIMILARLY ARE INTERACTIONS BETWEEN MANAGEMENT AND BOARD MEMBERS
AMONG FIDUCIARIES WITHIN THE COMPANY AND ARE OF A COMPLETELY
DIFFERENT NATURE FROM THE ALLEGATIONS THAT WERE SET FORTH IN
THE PRIOR INDICTMENT.

THEY REQUIRE A DIFFERENT LEVEL OF PREPARATION, THEY RAISE DIFFERENT LEGAL ISSUES, WHICH WILL REQUIRE ADDITIONAL MOTIONS SHOULD THE GRAND JURY RETURN AN INDICTMENT, AND FUNDAMENTALLY CHANGE THE NATURE OF OUR TRIAL PREPARATION.

10:43AM	1
10:43AM	2
10:44AM	3
10:44AM	4
10:44AM	5
10:44AM	6
10:44AM	7
10:44AM	8
10:44AM	9
10:44AM	10
10:44AM	11
10:44AM	12
10:44AM	13
10:44AM	14
10:45AM	15
10:45AM	16
10:45AM	17
10:45AM	18
10:45AM	19
10:45AM	20
10:45AM	21
10:45AM	22
10:45AM	23
10:45AM	24

10:45AM 25

I'LL SAY WITH A BIT OF FRUSTRATION THAT I WILL CONFESS TO THE COURT, ALTHOUGH MR. LEACH SUGGESTS THAT SOME OF THESE CHANGES FLOW FROM THE ORDER OF THE COURT AND THE MOTIONS TO DISMISS, WHICH OF COURSE WERE BRIEFED ON THE SCHEDULE THAT WAS AGREED TO BY ALL PARTIES AND PRESENTED AND APPROVED BY THE COURT, WHILE THOSE CHANGES MAY HAVE RESULTED WITH RESPECT TO THE NEW COUNTS RELATED TO THE PATIENTS, THE ORDER OF THE COURT HAS LITTLE OR NOTHING TO DO WITH THE EXPANSION OF THE INVESTOR-RELATED CONSPIRACY TO INCLUDE NEW THEORIES, NEW COUNTERPARTIES, NEW FIDUCIARIES, THAT HAVE LONG BEEN KNOWN TO THE GOVERNMENT AND WHICH THE GOVERNMENT HAS PREVIOUSLY CHOSEN NOT TO CHARGE.

WHY IT TOOK UNTIL THIS POINT TO ADD THOSE CHARGES TO THIS

CASE IS UNCLEAR TO THE DEFENSE. IT'S OF SOME FRUSTRATION GIVEN

ALL OF THE WORK THAT WE HAVE DONE THUS FAR.

AS THE COURT KNOWS, THERE ARE OVER 20 MILLION PAGES OF DOCUMENTS IN THIS CASE. MANY OF THOSE DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN REVIEWED WITH THE CURRENT INDICTMENT IN MIND. MANY OF THOSE DOCUMENTS WILL NOW NEED TO BE REVIEWED. MANY OF THE WITNESSES WILL NEED TO BE REASSESSED. THE HUNDREDS OF WITNESS STATEMENTS WILL NEED TO BE REVIEWED AND ADDRESSED WITH THE NATURE OF THESE ALLEGATIONS IN MIND, AGAIN, SHOULD THE GRAND JURY CHOOSE TO RETURN THIS INDICTMENT AND SHOULD THE CHARGES SURVIVE A MOTION TO DISMISS.

THAT'S A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF WORK ABOVE AND BEYOND THE

1 10:45AM 2 10:46AM 3 10:46AM 10:46AM 4 10:46AM 10:46AM 6 10:46AM 7 10:46AM 8 10:46AM 9 10:46AM 10 10:46AM 11 10:46AM 12 10:46AM 13 10:46AM 14 10:46AM 15 10:46AM 16 10:47AM 17 10:47AM 18 10:47AM 19 10:47AM 20 10:47AM 21 10:47AM 22 10:47AM 23 10:47AM 24 10:47AM 25

WORK THAT HAS PREVIOUSLY BEEN BEFORE US IN THIS MATTER.

FORTUNATELY, PERHAPS MAYBE ONE OF THE FEW UNFORTUNATE

THINGS THAT HAS COME FROM THE CURRENT HEALTH CRISIS, WE BELIEVE

THAT WE CAN STILL DO THAT WITHIN THIS AMOUNT OF TIME IN ADVANCE

OF EARLY 2021 WHEN WE THINK IT'S SENSIBLE TO PROCEED WITH THIS

MATTER IN ANY EVENT.

BUT WE THINK THE MINIMIZATION OF THESE ALLEGATIONS BY THE GOVERNMENT IS ONE WITH WHICH WE RESPECTFULLY DISAGREE AND ONE THAT REQUIRES SIGNIFICANTLY ADDITIONAL TIME.

THERE -- IT IS TRUE THAT SOME OF THESE RELATIONSHIPS WERE PREVIOUSLY ADDRESSED WITHIN THE INDICTMENT. WALGREENS, FOR EXAMPLE, IS SET FORTH IN THE INDICTMENT WITH THE ALLEGATION BEING THAT SOME OF THE DEALINGS WITH RESPECT TO WALGREENS WERE MISREPRESENTED TO OTHER INVESTORS.

THE NEW ALLEGATIONS WITHIN THE INDICTMENT ARE TOTALLY DIFFERENT. THERANOS IS SUGGESTING THAT WALGREENS ITSELF MAY HAVE BEEN DEFRAUDED IN SOME WAY.

WE, OF COURSE, WILL AGGRESSIVELY CONTEST THOSE

ALLEGATIONS, BUT THE TYPE OF PREPARATION REQUIRED TO DO SO IS

FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT FROM THE PREPARATION THAT WE HAVE

ENGAGED IN THUS FAR.

I'LL PAUSE THERE AND ASK IF THE COURT HAS ANY INQUIRIES,
I'M HAPPY TO ADDRESS THEM.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU, MR. WADE. THANK YOU FOR OUTLINING THE CHALLENGES THAT THE DEFENSE MIGHT FACE

10:47AM 1 2 10:47AM 3 10:47AM 10:47AM 4 10:48AM 10:48AM 10:48AM 8 10:48AM 10:48AM 9 10:48AM 10 10:48AM 11 10:48AM 12 10:48AM 13 10:48AM 14 10:48AM 15 10:48AM 16 10:48AM 17 10:48AM 18 10:48AM 19 10:48AM 20 10:49AM 21 10:49AM 22 10:49AM 23 10:49AM 24 10:49AM 25

SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT DECIDE TO SEEK A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT.

I'M GOING TO ASK PEOPLE TO PLEASE MUTE YOUR PHONES, PLEASE MUTE YOU'RE PHONES.

THANK YOU, MR. WADE.

ONE OF THE THOUGHTS AND CONCERNS THAT I HAVE ABOUT THE INFORMATION FROM THE GOVERNMENT THAT THEY MAY SEEK TO SUPERSEDE THE INDICTMENT IS THE TIMING OF THAT. AND THIS IS AGAIN SPECULATION, ASSUMING THAT OUR COURT IS BACK IN OPERATION, THAT IS, THE COURTHOUSE IS OPEN MAY 1ST, IN MAY THE GOVERNMENT WOULD THEN, I'M SURE THEY WOULD PROCEED WITH ALL HASTE TO GET THE GRAND JURY CONVENED AND PRESENT THIS AND THEN WE WOULD HAVE A RETURN.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE TIMELINE OF THAT POTENTIALLY IS, BUT OF COURSE BASED ON MR. WADE'S COMMENTS, AND IT'S COMMON KNOWLEDGE THAT WE WOULD EXPECT THAT ANY SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT WOULD BE LOOKED AT BY THE DEFENSE WITH CLOSE SCRUTINY AND THEN POTENTIAL MOTIONS TO DISMISS OR SOME OTHER MOTIONS MIGHT ARISE FROM THAT.

YOU'VE GIVEN ME A PROPOSED SCHEDULE IN DOCUMENT 372, AND I'M JUST CURIOUS ABOUT WHAT -- LET'S JUST ASSUME THAT A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT IS RECEIVED ALONG THE LINES THAT THE GOVERNMENT HAS PROPOSED.

I WONDER FROM BOTH SIDES, CAN YOU GIVE ME YOUR THOUGHTS

ABOUT MOTION PRACTICE IN REGARDS TO THAT AND HOW THAT, THAT IS,

HOW THAT MOTION PRACTICE FITS INTO THE CURRENT PROPOSED

10:49AM 1 SCHEDULES THAT YOU'VE PRESENTED?

MR. LEACH, I'M NOT SURE YOU HAVE SUFFICIENT INFORMATION TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION BECAUSE THE MOTION PRACTICE WOULD BE GENERATED, OF COURSE, BY THE DEFENSE, BUT I'M HAPPY TO START WITH YOU IF YOU HAVE SOME THOUGHTS ON THAT.

MR. LEACH: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

THAT'S RIGHT, I DON'T HAVE A SENSE OF WHAT MOTIONS THEY INTEND, AND SO I'M NOT REALLY IN A POSITION TO TALK ABOUT THE TIMING OF THAT.

I DO THINK UNDER THE SCHEDULE PROPOSED BY THE GOVERNMENT
WE HAVE MOTIONS IN LIMINE NOT STARTING UNTIL AUGUST, AND WE
HAVE A STATUS CONFERENCE FOR JULY 13TH.

I WOULD CERTAINLY THINK THAT -- I MEAN, WE HAVE BEEN AS

TRANSPARENT ABOUT -- BY PROVIDING THE SUPERSEDING, DRAFT

SUPERSEDING INFORMATION ABOUT WHAT THE GOVERNMENT'S INTENTIONS

ARE.

I WOULD THINK THAT THE DEFENSE HAS IN MIND WHAT THEY WANT TO DO.

I THINK IF WE HAVE A MID-JULY, LATE JULY STATUS CONFERENCE
THAT SHOULD AFFORD SUFFICIENT TIME FOR THEM TO DRAFT THE
GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE ANYTHING THAT THEY THINK IS APPROPRIATE.
I REALLY DON'T HAVE A SENSE OF WHAT THEY HAVE IN MIND, BUT WE
WOULD BE PREPARED TO PROCEED UNDER WHATEVER SCHEDULE THE COURT
THINKS IS APPROPRIATE FOR THIS.

THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.

10:50AM 25

1 10:51AM 2 10:51AM 3 10:51AM 10:51AM 4 10:51AM 10:51AM 10:51AM 7 10:51AM 8 10:51AM 9 10:51AM 10 10:51AM 11 10:51AM 12 10:52AM 13 10:52AM 14 10:52AM 15 10:52AM 16 10:52AM 17 10:52AM 18 10:52AM 19 10:52AM 20 10:52AM 21 10:52AM 22 10:52AM 23 10:52AM 24 10:52AM 25

THAT'S A THOUGHT THAT CAME TO MIND, MR. WADE -- I'LL NEXT CALL UPON YOU -- IS IF THE GOVERNMENT PROCEEDED -- WELL,

THERE'S A LOT OF "IF'S" HERE. ASSUMING WE'RE BACK IN THE

COURTHOUSE IN MAY AND THE GOVERNMENT IS DILIGENT ABOUT

CONVENING A GRAND JURY, AND THE GRAND JURY DOES RETURN A

SUPERSEDING DOCUMENT AS THEY'VE INDICATED, AND AS THEY'VE

PROVIDED TO YOU, THE NEXT THOUGHT I HAVE REGARDING SCHEDULING

IS WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS ABOUT GETTING MOTION PRACTICE AS TO

THAT SUPERSEDING DOCUMENT COMPLETED BY THE JULY, ASSUMING WE

FOLLOW A JULY, A LATE JULY STATUS CONFERENCE?

MR. WADE: YOUR HONOR, OF COURSE THE WAY THAT WE USUALLY APPROACH A SCHEDULE IN A CASE IS TO START WITH WHEN WE THINK BASED UPON THE INDICTMENT WHEN A TRIAL DATE -- WHEN WE COULD BE READY FOR TRIAL AND WE TRY TO WORK BACK AND SET A LOGICAL AND SEQUENTIAL PATH BETWEEN THAT TRIAL DATE AND TO HIT ALL OF THESE ITEMS.

A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT THAT IS RETURNED, IF THE GRAND

JURY RETURNS IN MAY, AND I'LL NOTE THAT I DO HAVE MATTERS IN

OTHER COURTS WHERE GRAND JURIES WERE INITIALLY EXTENDED UNTIL

MAY, BUT THAT'S NOW BEEN -- THOSE GRAND JURIES HAVE NOW BEEN

DEFERRED FURTHER INTO JULY. BUT IF IT COMES IN MAY, YOU KNOW,

WE WOULD OBVIOUSLY NEED TIME TO ADDRESS TO CONSIDER THAT.

WE'LL, OF COURSE, BASED ON THE REPRESENTATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, BEGIN THINKING ABOUT WAYS IN WHICH WE MIGHT APPROACH SUCH CHARGES IF THE GRAND JURY DECIDES TO CONVENE THEM

OR TO RETURN THEM.

BUT THERE ARE A NUMBER OF OTHER, YOU KNOW, RELATED ISSUES
THAT COME INTO THE CASE AS A RESULT OF THAT ACTIVITY THAT WOULD
ALSO NEED TO BE ACCOMMODATED IN THE SCHEDULE.

THERE'S A POTENTIAL NEED FOR SUBSTANTIAL ADDITIONAL WORK

THAT WOULD BE REQUIRED BY THE DEFENSE BASED ON INFORMATION

PROVIDED TO THE GOVERNMENT AS TO WHAT THEY MIGHT SEEK. WE

BELIEVE WE MAY NEED TO RETAIN AN EXPERT OR MORE GIVEN THE

NATURE OF SOME OF THE ALLEGATIONS.

MANY OF THE PEOPLE WHO THE GOVERNMENT HAS IDENTIFIED, MANY
OF THE WITNESSES WHO HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED WHO WOULD BE
IMPLICATED BY AN INDICTMENT OF THIS TYPE WE HAVE NOT
SUBPOENAED, WE HAVE NOT SOUGHT DOCUMENTS, WE HAVE NOT DONE WHAT
WE WOULD DO IN AN ORDINARY COURSE IF THESE ALLEGATIONS WERE IN
THE INDICTMENT.

SO OF COURSE NOW IT'S NOT PRUDENT GIVEN HEALTH CONDITIONS
TO PROCEED WITH SOME OF THOSE SUBPOENAS UNLESS PEOPLE WERE TO
ACCEPT THEM VOLUNTARILY.

SO THERE ARE A NUMBER OF THINGS THAT NEED TO HAPPEN. I
THINK WE UNDOUBTEDLY COULD TRY TO MEET AND CONFER WITH THE
GOVERNMENT AND WOULD IN ANY COURSE ONCE WE DETERMINE A
REASONABLE TRIAL DATE TO TRY TO SET A SENSIBLE SCHEDULE, BUT I
THINK TRYING TO INJECT THIS INTO THESE ALREADY DIFFICULT
CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD NECESSITATE A DELAY IN THE VIEW OF THE
DEFENSE.

10:54AM 25

1

2

3

4

10:53AM

10:53AM

10:53AM

10:53AM

1	(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)
2	MR. WADE: IS THE COURT STILL THERE?
3	THE COURT: I AM STILL HERE, BUT YOU KNOW WHAT, I
4	DID NOT HAVE THE GOOD SENSE TO UNMUTE MY PHONE.
5	THANK YOU. SO THANK YOU, MR. WADE. THANK YOU FOR THAT.
6	WHAT I HEAR YOU SAYING IS THAT SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT
7	PROCEED AND SECURE A SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT ALONG THE LINES OF
8	THE PROPOSED DRAFT THAT THEY HAVE PROVIDED YOU, IT WOULD CHANGE
9	THE COMPLEXION OF YOUR OBVIOUSLY OF WHAT YOU NEED TO DO.
10	YOU WOULD LOOK AT THE CASE AND DETERMINE WHETHER YOU CAN GO
11	FORWARD WITH FILING MOTIONS, YOUR MOTIONS PRIOR TO THE JULY
12	DATE AND THE STATUS DATE THAT WE HAVE.
13	THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO SEE IF WE CAN, IF WE CAN GET
14	MOTION PRACTICE SCHEDULED AND HEARD BY THAT DATE, THAT WOULD BE
15	IDEAL AT LEAST FOR MOVING FORWARD.
16	I WAS PROBING TO SEE IF THAT OF COURSE YOU CAN'T
17	PREDICT ANYTHING AND YOU DON'T HAVE BENEFIT OF ANYTHING IN
18	FRONT OF YOU. I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE CAN DO.
19	MR. WADE: YEAH. MY APOLOGIES. IT'S DIFFICULT
20	SOMETIMES TO NOT INTERRUPT THE COURT IN THIS FORUM. SO MY
21	APOLOGIES TO THE COURT.
22	THE COURT: NO, NO, NOT AT ALL.
23	MR. WADE: THE WE, OF COURSE, WOULD WORK TO
24	PROCEED WITH MOTIONS DIRECTED AT ANY NEW INDICTMENT AS QUICKLY
25	AS WE POSSIBLY COULD, YOUR HONOR, JUST TO BE CLEAR.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

MY OTHER COMMENTS ARE JUST DIRECTED -- AND TO THE EXTENT 1 10:57AM 10:57AM 2 THAT AN INDICTMENT WAS RETURNED, YOU KNOW, REASONABLY IN ADVANCE OF THE JULY STATUS CONFERENCE, WE WOULD CERTAINLY 3 10:57AM 10:57AM 4 ENDEAVOR TO TRY TO FIT BRIEFING IN IN ADVANCE OF THAT. 10:57AM 5 MY OTHER COMMENTS WERE MERELY DIRECTED -- MEANT TO DIRECT 10:57AM 6 THE COURT'S ATTENTION TO THE FACT THAT THERE IS OBVIOUSLY MUCH 10:57AM 7 MORE THAT IS NEEDED HERE BEYOND JUST THE BRIEFING ON THE MOTION TO DISMISS. 10:57AM 8 THE COURT: SURE. THANK YOU. 10:57AM 9 10:57AM 10 ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. LET ME ASK, MR. LEACH, ANYTHING 10:57AM 11 YOU WOULD LIKE TO SAY ABOUT THE SCHEDULING ISSUE REGARDING THE 10:57AM 12 MOTIONS AND THE SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT? 10:57AM 13 MR. LEACH: NO, YOUR HONOR. JUST THAT I FUNDAMENTALLY DISAGREE THAT THIS IS A SEA CHANGE. THIS IS THE 10:57AM 14 10:57AM 15 SAME THEORY AND THE SAME CASE WITH DISCOVERY THAT THEY'VE HAD FOR THE BETTER PART OF A YEAR AND A HALF. 10:58AM 16 10:58AM 17 THE DEFENSE IS IN A MUCH BETTER POSITION TO DESCRIBE ITS 10:58AM 18 PREPARATION THAN WE ARE, BUT WE FUNDAMENTALLY JUST DO NOT SEE 10:58AM 19 THIS AS THE SEA CHANGE THAT IS DESCRIBED. AND -- BUT BEYOND 10:58AM 20 THAT, I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER. 10:58AM 21 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 10:58AM 22 MR. WADE, ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD? 10:58AM 23 MR. WADE: NO, YOUR HONOR. 10:58AM 24 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WELL, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 10:58AM 25 THE STATUS HEARING TODAY WAS SCHEDULED TO DETERMINE WHAT

WE SHOULD DO GOING FORWARD IN LIGHT OF THE COVID CRISIS THAT 1 10:58AM THE NATION FACES AND IN LIGHT OF THE LIMITATIONS THAT THAT 2 10:58AM BRINGS TO THIS COURT TO PROVIDE SAFE ENVIRONMENTS FOR ALL 3 10:58AM 10:58AM 4 PARTIES TO THE CASE AS WELL AS THE PUBLIC AND ALL OF OUR COURT PERSONNEL AS WELL. 10:58AM 10:59AM 6 WE HAVE, AS I THINK SOMEONE SAID, WE'RE IN UNCHARTERED 10:59AM 7 WATERS NOW AND TERRITORY NOW IN REGARDS TO HOW TO MANAGE OUR CALENDARS. WE KNOW THAT THE PRIME DIRECTIVE IS TO ENSURE THAT 10:59AM 8 ALL PARTIES RECEIVE FAIR TREATMENT IN THE COURTS, BUT THE REAL 10:59AM 9 10:59AM 10 PRIME DIRECTIVE NOW ADDENDUM TO THAT IS TO PROCEED WITH CAUTION 10:59AM 11 AND SAFETY TO MAKE SURE THAT EVERYONE WHO ENTERS OUR COURTS ARE 10:59AM 12 SAFE, FIRST OF ALL. THAT WE OPEN OUR COURTS, WHEN WE OPEN OUR 10:59AM 13 COURTS, THAT THEY ARE IN A SAFE ENVIRONMENT FOR ALL, ALL CONCERNED, INCLUDING THE PUBLIC, THE PUBLIC WHO WE WOULD CALL 10:59AM 14 10:59AM 15 AS JURORS TO SIT IN THE MATTER. AND WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THE JURORS HAVE CONFIDENCE THAT THE COURTROOMS THAT THEY'RE 10:59AM 16 10:59AM 17 SITTING IN --10:59AM 18 THE CLERK: EXCUSE ME, YOUR HONOR. I BELIEVE 10:59AM 19 SOMEONE NEEDS TO MUTE THEIR PHONE. THERE'S INTERRUPTION GOING 11:00AM 20 ON. IF YOU COULD PLEASE MUTE YOUR PHONE. 11:00AM 21 THE COURT: YES, YES. PLEASE MUTE YOUR PHONES, 11:00AM 22 PLEASE. THANK YOU. 11:00AM 23 THE CLERK: SORRY, YOUR HONOR. 11:00AM 24 THE COURT: THANK YOU. THANK YOU, MS. KRATZMANN. 11:00AM 25 WE NEED TO MAKE SURE THE ENVIRONMENT IS SAFE FOR ALL

1 11:00AM 2 11:00AM 3 11:00AM 11:00AM 4 11:00AM 11:00AM 11:00AM 8 11:00AM 11:00AM 9 11:00AM 10 11:01AM 11 11:01AM 12 11:01AM 13 11:01AM 14 11:01AM 15 11:01AM 16 11:01AM 17 11:01AM 18 11:01AM 19 11:01AM 20 11:01AM 21 11:01AM 22 11:01AM 23 11:02AM 24

11:02AM 25

PARTIES, WE NEED TO ENSURE TO OUR JURORS, THE PUBLIC THAT WE CALL, THE COMMUNITY THAT IS CALLED TO HEAR MATTERS, THAT THE COURT CAN ENSURE THEIR SAFETY SUCH THAT THEY HAVE CONFIDENCE IN THEIR JUSTICE SYSTEM AND THEY HAVE CONFIDENCE THAT THEY CAN FOCUS ON THE ISSUES BEFORE THEM IN A TRIAL SUCH THAT THEY CAN PROVIDE A FAIR HEARING FOR ALL SIDES. THAT'S A CRITICAL COMPONENT OF THE WORK THAT THEY DO AND WHAT WE WANT TO ENSURE TO THE JURY IN THIS CASE.

I DO THINK THAT LOOKING AT OUR SCHEDULE AND THIS COURT HAS BEEN, AND I KNOW COUNSEL HAVE CALLED ME ON IT, IS I'VE BEEN A LITTLE AGGRESSIVE ABOUT THE TRIAL SCHEDULE ON THIS. I DO THINK THAT THE SCHEDULE FOR JULY AS I INITIALLY PROPOSED IS NOT REALISTIC NOW GIVEN THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT WE FACE. I JUST DON'T THINK THAT THAT'S A REALITY.

I'D LIKE TO THINK THAT, AND I HOPE THAT TRIAL IN OCTOBER
OF THIS YEAR IS SOMETHING THAT WE COULD, WE COULD ENGAGE. I
KNOW EVERY DAY THE NEWS CHANGES ABOUT COVID AND ABOUT WHETHER
OR NOT THINGS WILL BEGIN TO REACH NORMALITY AND THAT DOESN'T
MEAN THAT WE'LL HAVE ANY NORMAL SENSE OF OUR SOCIETY IN
OCTOBER. WE HOPE WE DO, BUT SHELTER IN PLACE REMAINS AND IN
MANY STATES, AND CERTAINLY IN THE ENVIRONMENT AND JURISDICTION
OF THE COURTHOUSE.

I'D LIKE TO -- WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS LOOK AT THE OCTOBER

DATE, THE LATER OCTOBER DATE THAT WAS PROPOSED AS A POTENTIAL

TRIAL DATE, AND I THINK IT WISE, AND I'M GRATEFUL TO BOTH SIDES

1 11:02AM 2 11:02AM 3 11:02AM 11:02AM 4 11:02AM 11:02AM 11:02AM 7 8 11:02AM 11:02AM 9 11:02AM 10 11:02AM 11 11:03AM 12 11:03AM 13 11:03AM 14 11:03AM 15 11:03AM 16 11:03AM 17 11:03AM 18 11:03AM 19 11:03AM 20 11:03AM 21 11:03AM 22 11:03AM 23 11:03AM 24 11:04AM 25

HERE, TO SUGGEST THAT WE HAVE AN INTERIM STATUS CONFERENCE IN
JULY AT LEAST CALENDARED. THAT'S NOT TO SAY THAT WE WON'T
ADVANCE THAT IF NEEDED, BUT AT LEAST CALENDARED IN JULY SO WE
CAN LOOK FORWARD AND SEE WHAT AND HOW BEST WE CAN FORECAST
WHETHER OR NOT THE OCTOBER DATE IS A REALITY OR WHETHER OR NOT
IT MAKES MORE SENSE TO LOOK BEYOND THE FALL AND INTO THE NEW
YEAR, EARLY NEW YEAR.

WHAT I THINK WE HAVE ALL READ AND FROM EXPERTS, AND THERE ARE MANY OF THEM ON THIS CRISIS THAT WE FACE, THE INFORMATION AT LEAST THAT THE COURT HAS READ AND SOME OF IT HAS INDICATED THAT LIKE THE NORMAL FLU VIRUS THAT SEEMS TO COME AROUND IN THE WINTER AND FALL, THERE'S AN EXPECTATION THAT THIS COVID MAY RETURN IN THE FALL IN SOME MANNER AND WE SHOULD BE COGNIZANT OF THAT.

WE'RE SO GRATEFUL FOR OUR HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS AND ALL OF THOSE SCIENTISTS AND BIOENGINEERS WHO ARE WORKING DILIGENTLY TO TRY AND TO FIND SOME TYPE OF SERUM THAT CAN PROTECT ALL OF US, A VACCINE THAT CAN PROTECT ALL OF US FROM THIS DISEASE.

BUT WE ALL KNOW THAT TAKES TIME, IT DOES TAKE TIME.

WE DON'T KNOW -- WE CAN'T FORECAST WHAT THE HEALTH

CONDITIONS OF THIS COUNTRY WILL BE IN RELATION TO COVID. WE

ALL, WE JUST ARE IN DESPAIR WHEN WE READ ABOUT THE LOSS THAT

THIS COVID HAS CAUSED ACROSS THE COUNTRY. WE REALLY ARE -- OUR

HEARTS ARE IN PAIN WHEN WE READ ABOUT NEW YORK, DETROIT, AND

OTHER CITIES, LOUISIANA, AND OTHER CITIES. SO WE'RE MINDFUL OF 1 11:04AM 2 THAT. AND THAT PRESSES UPON ALL OF US AS WE LOOK FORWARD TO 11:04AM WHAT WE CAN DO WITH OUR CASE. 3 11:04AM 11:04AM 4 SO LET ME SAY WHAT I THINK WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS TO SET A 11:04AM 5 DATE FOR TRIAL, RESCHEDULE THE TRIAL DATE TO THE OCTOBER 26TH 11:04AM 6 DATE. I HAVE YOUR SCHEDULE IN DOCUMENT 372. I DO THINK THAT 11:04AM 7 WE SHOULD MAKE SOME CHANGES TO THAT SCHEDULE GOING FORWARD. FOLKS, IF YOU HAVE YOUR SCHEDULES IN FRONT OF YOU, I'D 11:04AM 8 LIKE TO GO DOWN SOME OF THE DATES AND DEADLINES AND EVENTS THAT 11:04AM 9 11:04AM 10 YOU HAVE AND SUGGEST SOME CHANGES TO THAT. 11:05AM 11 THE CLERK: YOUR HONOR, MAY I JUST INTERJECT A 11:05AM 12 MOMENT? THE COURT: YES. YES. 11:05AM 13 THE CLERK: THIS IS ADRIANA. COULD WE SET THE 11:05AM 14 11:05AM 15 OCTOBER DATE TO OCTOBER 27TH DATE TO TUESDAY? THE COURT: YES, YES. OCTOBER 27TH AT 9:00 A.M. FOR 11:05AM 16 11:05AM 17 JURY SELECTION. 11:05AM 18 GOING DOWN. THIS IS FOUND ON PAGES 4 AND 5 OF 372. I DO 11:05AM 19 NOTE THAT LET'S START THAT THERE'S AGREEMENT ON THE FIRST 11:05AM 20 SERVICE OF THE SUMMARY PURSUANT TO RULE 16, AND I'M NOT GOING TO DISTURB THAT AT THIS POINT. WE MAY HAVE SOME OTHER COMMENT 11:05AM 21 11:05AM 22 ON THAT IN A MOMENT. 11:06AM 23 THE GOVERNMENT IN IT'S RULE 16(A) DISCLOSURES WHICH BEGINS 11:06AM 24 ON LINE 26, I THINK THE DATE, WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS TO ADOPT 11:06AM 25 THE GOVERNMENT DATE ON THAT.

11:06AM	1	I'M LOOKING IN THAT BOX, AND PERHAPS YOU CAN HELP ME,
11:06AM	2	COUNSEL, LINE 27 AND 28 IT INDICATES THE GOVERNMENT SERVE
11:06AM	3	WITNESSES AND EXHIBITS LISTS FOR CASE-IN-CHIEF.
11:06AM	4	WAS THAT THE SAME PROPOSED DATE?
11:06AM	5	MR. LEACH: YEAH, THAT WAS INTENDED TO BE JUNE 26TH,
11:06AM	6	2020.
11:06AM	7	THE COURT: OKAY. AS WELL AS PAGE 5 BEGINNING AT
11:06AM	8	LINE 1, THE 801
11:06AM	9	MR. LEACH: YES.
11:06AM	10	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.
11:06AM	11	THEN ALSO ON THE RULE 16B DISCLOSURES ON LINE 3 I'LL ADOPT
11:06AM	12	THE GOVERNMENT'S DATE TO THE LATER DATE OF JULY 6TH ON THAT.
11:06AM	13	THE NEXT BOX, WHICH APPEARS ON LINE 4 THROUGH 6, I'M GOING
11:07AM	14	TO DEFER THAT FOR NOW.
11:07AM	15	ACTUALLY, THE FIRST BOX THAT I TALKED ABOUT, I'M SORRY TO
11:07AM	16	GO BACK, ON PAGE 4, LINE 23, I'M GOING TO DEFER THAT AS WELL
11:07AM	17	FOR NOW.
11:07AM	18	RETURNING TO PAGE 5, NOW WE'RE AT LINE 6 THROUGH 8, THE
11:07AM	19	DEFENSE SERVICE OF WITNESS AND EXHIBIT LISTS, I'M GOING TO
11:07AM	20	ADJUST THAT DATE TO JULY 24TH.
11:07AM	21	AND THEN THE STATUS CONFERENCE WILL BE SET FOR,
11:07AM	22	MS. KRATZMANN, JULY 20TH, JULY 20TH, AT 10:00 A.M.
11:07AM	23	NOW, AT THAT TIME ON JULY 20TH, WE WILL HAVE A BETTER IDEA
11:08AM	24	AS TO WHETHER WE'RE GOING TO GO FORWARD WITH THE OCTOBER TRIAL
11:08AM	25	DATE OR WHETHER WE NEED TO ADJUST THE SCHEDULE IN SOME OTHER

MANNER.

1

2

11:08AM

11:08AM

I'M NOT GOING TO -- AT THIS TIME I'M NOT GOING TO

ADOPT ANY OF THE OTHER -- YOU HAVE OTHER DATES THAT BEGIN IN

AUGUST AND OTHERS AND MOTIONS IN LIMINES AND THOSE DATES. I'D

LIKE TO DEFER THOSE DATES. I THINK WE CAN WAIT UNTIL THE

JULY 20TH DATE TO SEE WHETHER OR NOT AND HOW WE'RE GOING TO

PROCEED AND GO FORWARD THERE.

SO I'D LIKE YOU TO -- OBVIOUSLY YOU'RE GOING TO PREPARE

THE CASE AS BEST YOU CAN, I KNOW THAT, BUT I DON'T THINK YOU

NEED TO PAY ATTENTION TO THOSE ITEMS THAT APPEAR FROM LINES 10

DOWN TO 19 AT THIS POINT. I'D LIKE YOU TO FOCUS YOUR EFFORTS,

OF COURSE, ON THE OTHER WORK THAT YOU NEED TO DO, AND WE CAN

LOOK AT THOSE REMAINING ISSUES, THE IN LIMINE AND OTHER ISSUES,

ON THE JULY 20TH STATUS CONFERENCE DATE.

ANY QUESTIONS FROM EITHER SIDE ABOUT THIS ADJUSTMENT?

MR. LEACH: NOT FROM THE GOVERNMENT, YOUR HONOR.

THAT'S CLEAR TO US. THANK YOU.

THE COURT: MR. WADE?

MR. WADE: NO, YOUR HONOR. I TAKE IT AS WE GET

CLOSER TO THESE EVENTS WE'LL PERHAPS HAVE COMMUNICATION THROUGH

MS. KRATZMANN AS TO WHETHER THESE PROCEEDINGS WILL BE

TELEPHONIC OR IN PERSON?

OBVIOUSLY, I THINK WE ALL HOPE WE'RE IN A SITUATION WHERE THEY'RE IN PERSON, BUT WE WILL SEE WHAT IS PRUDENT AT THAT TIME.

11:09AM 25

THE COURT: YES. THANK YOU, MR. WADE. 1 11:09AM I'M HOPEFUL THAT WE CAN, THAT THINGS CHANGE IN OUR COUNTRY 2 11:09AM AND IN OUR REGIONS THAT WE COULD HAVE IN-PERSON MEETINGS. 3 11:09AM 11:09AM 4 AGAIN, I'LL JUST SAY I ALWAYS ENJOY ALL OF YOU IN THE COURTROOM. YOU'RE ALL PROFESSIONAL, AND I APPRECIATE THAT. I 11:10AM 11:10AM 6 KNOW THAT YOU'RE TRIAL LAWYERS AND THE PLACE YOU WORK IS THE 11:10AM 7 COURTROOM, NOT YOUR LIVING ROOMS, KITCHENS, OR HOME OFFICES, WHICH OF COURSE YOU DO THAT IN THE EVENINGS AND INTO THE WEE 11:10AM 8 HOURS OF THE NIGHT, I RECOGNIZE THAT. 11:10AM 9 11:10AM 10 BUT THE PLACE YOU DO YOUR BUSINESS IS IN THE COURTROOM, 11:10AM 11 AND ALL OF YOU HAVE GREAT FLUENCY FOR THE COURTROOM, AND SO I 11:10AM 12 AGREE. I HOPE THAT WE CAN OPEN OUR COURTROOMS SOON, AND WE ALL 11:10AM 13 CAN ENJOY EACH OTHER'S COMPANY. WE'RE WORKING ON WHAT WE NEED TO DO TO ESTABLISH VIDEO 11:10AM 14 11:10AM 15 CONFERENCING IN THE INTERIM, AND SO IF WE NEED IT, HOPEFULLY WE'LL HAVE SOMETHING SET UP FOR FUTURE STATUS CONFERENCES IF WE 11:10AM 16 11:10AM 17 CAN. 11:10AM 18 ALSO, AS TO ANY OTHER MATTERS, AS YOU POINT OUT, MR. WADE, 11:10AM 19 MS. KRATZMANN WILL BE ABLE TO COMMUNICATE ANY OTHER SCHEDULE 11:11AM 20 CHANGES FOR ANY OTHER MATTERS AS THEY NEED TO COME UP, AND I 11:11AM 21 DON'T KNOW IF THAT ANSWERS YOUR QUESTION. I HOPE IT DOES. 11:11AM 22 MR. WADE: IT DOES. THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 11:11AM 23 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. ANYTHING ELSE THAT EITHER 11:11AM 24 SIDE WISHES TO RAISE AT THIS TIME? 11:11AM 25 MR. LEACH, ANYTHING FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S TEAM?

MR. LEACH: YOUR HONOR, IN LIGHT OF THE CHANGE OF 1 11:11AM 2 THE TRIAL DATE FROM OCTOBER -- WELL, FROM THE END OF JULY TO 11:11AM OCTOBER 27TH, 2020, I THINK IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR THE 3 11:11AM 11:11AM 4 COURT TO EXCLUDE TIME FOR EFFECTIVE PREPARATION IN LIGHT OF THE 11:11AM 5 COVID CRISIS AND EVERYTHING THAT MR. WADE HAS DESCRIBED. 11:11AM 6 THE COURT: THANK YOU. I WAS GOING TO TURN TO 11:11AM 7 MR. WADE WHEN HIS COMMENTS -- DURING HIS COMMENTS AND ASK HIM IF HE AGREES THAT TIME SHOULD BE EXCLUDED FOR EFFECTIVE 11:11AM 8 PREPARATION OF COUNSEL TO THE NEW TRIAL OF OCTOBER 26TH, 2020. 11:11AM 9 11:12AM 10 MR. WADE? 11:12AM 11 MR. WADE: YOUR HONOR, WE DO. I BELIEVE IT ALSO MAY BE COVERED BY ONE OF THE COURT'S GENERAL ORDERS AS WELL, BUT IN 11:12AM 12 11:12AM 13 ANY EVENT, WE DO AGREE. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU THEN. 11:12AM 14 11:12AM 15 ANYTHING FURTHER FROM YOU, MR. WADE, AND YOUR TEAM? MR. WADE: NOT AT THIS TIME, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU. 11:12AM 16 11:12AM 17 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THANK 11:12AM 18 YOU ALL FOR YOUR ATTENTION HERE. WE WILL -- AND LET ME SAY, IF 11:12AM 19 EITHER PARTY WISHES TO HAVE ANOTHER STATUS OR A STATUS 11:12AM 20 CONFERENCE OR BRING ANYTHING TO THE COURT'S ATTENTION, PLEASE 11:12AM 21 FEEL FREE TO DO SO. 11:12AM 22 I'VE SET THE JULY 20TH DATE AS THE CALENDARED STATUS DATE 11:12AM 23 SO WE ALL HAVE AN EVENT HORIZON TO FOCUS ON. BUT SHOULD THE 11:12AM 24 NEED ARISE OR A CHANGE OR SOMETHING HAPPENS, PLEASE CONTACT 11:12AM 25 MS. KRATZMANN, AND WE WILL OF COURSE ENGAGE THE STATUS OR OTHER

11:12AM	1	HEARING AS NEEDED IF THE PARTIES REQUIRE.
11:12AM	2	ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. LET ME THANK YOU ALL AGAIN. IT'S
11:12AM	3	GOOD TO HEAR YOUR VOICES. I LOOK FORWARD TO THE OPPORTUNITY
11:13AM	4	WHEN I CAN SEE YOUR FACES PERSONALLY AND WE CAN INVITE YOU BACK
11:13AM	5	TO A SAFE COURTROOM AND I CAN ENJOY YOUR COMPANY AND ALL OF
11:13AM	6	YOUR ASSISTANCE IN THIS INTERESTING CASE.
11:13AM	7	PLEASE BE SAFE, YOU AND YOUR FAMILIES. I WISH YOU THE
11:13AM	8	BEST AND PLEASE BE SAFE AND WELL, AND WE'LL TALK AGAIN SOON.
11:13AM	9	ANYTHING FURTHER, MS. KRATZMANN?
11:13AM	10	THE CLERK: NO, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU.
11:13AM	11	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. WE'LL DISENGAGE
11:13AM	12	THE LINE NOW. THANK YOU, COUNSEL.
11:13AM	13	MR. WADE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
11:13AM	14	MR. LEACH: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, YOUR HONOR.
11:13AM	15	(TELEPHONIC COURT CONCLUDED AT 11:13 A.M.)
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	

1	
2	
3	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
4	
5	
6	
7	I, THE UNDERSIGNED OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER OF THE UNITED
8	STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA,
9	280 SOUTH FIRST STREET, SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY
10	CERTIFY:
11	THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT, CERTIFICATE INCLUSIVE, IS
12	A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE
13	ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.
14	Orene Rodriguez
15	Calling 1 your his
16	IRENE RODRIGUEZ, CSR, RMR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 8074
17	
18	DATED: JULY 20, 2020
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	